

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 18, 2006. Claims 1, 4 to 6, 12, 15 to 17, 23, 26 and 29 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 12, 23, 26 and 29 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner made specific requests for information pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.105. Specifically, the Examiner requested translations of the Japanese Office Actions dated October 12, 2004 and January 21, 2005. In response to this request, included herewith are translations of the Examiner's comments from those Office Actions. In addition, attached are complete English-language translations of JP 4-352274 and JP 4-321162, both of which were cited in the October 12, 2004 Japanese Office Action and in an Information Disclosure Statement filed in the USPTO on January 12, 2005. Also attached is a Form PTO-1449 which lists these two Japanese references and indicates that translations have been submitted.

It is noted that, in the request under 37 CFR § 1.105, a list of seemingly irrelevant information sources was included. This list is taken *verbatim* from guidelines in the M.P.E.P. As such, it appears that the list was inadvertently included in the request. The Examiner is respectfully requested to confirm whether or not the list was meant to be included in the Office Action.

As an initial matter, JP 9-267277 was allowed during board of appeal proceedings. The translation of JP 9-267277 as requested by the Examiner is forthcoming and will be submitted as soon as it is available.

Furthermore, Claims 1, 12 and 26 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 1, 12, 23, 26 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Amendments to Claims 1, 12, 23, 26 and 29 are seen to attend to both the objection and rejection. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal.

Turning to specific claim language, an information processing apparatus which can access a plurality of databases. The apparatus comprises first copying means for copying data selected from a first database to a second database; determination means for determining if each of attribute items of attribute information appended to the copied data corresponds to each of attribute items of the second database; and second copying means for copying content data of an attribute item as content data of a corresponding attribute item of the second database if it is determined by said determination means that the attribute item corresponds to one of the attribute items of the second database, and for copying content data of an attribute item and item information indicating the attribute item as content data of a predetermined attribute item of the second database in a predetermined format if it is determined by said determination means that the attribute item does not correspond to any of the attribute items of the second database, wherein said predetermined format indicates information of a mismatching attribute item.

Claims 12, 23, 26 and 29 are directed respectively to an information processing method, a database system, a method of controlling a database system and a computer-readable storage medium storing a computer-executable control program which are seen to generally correspond with Claim 1.

As understood by Applicant, JP 4-352274 teaches storing content of item data in a predetermined field (i.e., a remarks field) of the destination database, wherein the item does not correspond to any item in a destination database.

JP 4-352274 fails to disclose or suggest storing item data in a form of item information and content data, in which the item does not correspond to any item in a destination database. As a result, JP 4-352274 cannot always restore the data, from a destination database to a source database, whose item does not correspond to any item in the destination database, because JP 4-352274 does not store item data in a form of item information and content data. Thus, JP 4-352274 fails to disclose the features of the claimed invention.

According to Applicant's best determination, Applicant respectfully submits that reference JP 4-321162 is seen to be irrelevant because there are no longer any pending claims that the reference is related to. However, a

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire Reg. #42,419/

Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 1529038v1